

(Occult Philosophy, Page 257)  
INTEGRATION

Philosophy  
Yr. XXXIII-5  
Jan. 17, 1981  
(Recorded 12/20/48)

### MONDAY NIGHT TALKS

Recorded in New York by Marc Edmund Jones for students in the Sabian Assembly and not to be reproduced. Contributions toward costs may be mailed to Genevieve D. Jacob, 219 Inter-villa Ave., West Lawn, Pa. 19609

This is the chapter on Integration. Integration, and then Manifestation which ends our excursion into the book of Occult Philosophy.

"Man finds he is a social entity, that is, more than himself individually, whenever he attempts either to act or to refrain from action in any particular situation." Why? Well, "first of all his ancestors come along with him" - whether he'll act or not act. Everyone whose blood converges in you, is present in your tendency to act or not act. Also, "he is accompanied by the near or actual contemporaries who have helped dramatize" things. "His various immediate stirrings are not movements in a vacuum," but there is "co-operative interactivity through which he furthers his own ends while also and equally contributing to the convenience of parallel existents on all sides." He advances the interests of others, and the others advance his interests. Social - what's more, these connections in time and space are only a small part of the total complexity. The special skills he has, or the special graces - linking particularly with particular people, so that we get the idea of never less alone when alone because of all that are with you.

Now this means that every individual is not only an impersonal identity and a personal being, two things in terms of our dichotomy in the healing between the whole and the parts, between the one or the all and the many or the separate fragments in that dichotomy, which is the impersonal identity. That's the fragmented one. An impersonal identity in the sense that it is atomistic, is an identity. Then there is a personal being or self which is in essence the all - to some degree it has in it something of every other person. In addition to that, the individual is also an immortal spirit because he is conscious. He is an immortal spirit in an unbroken self-discrimination. That's a summary of the previous chapter on the self.

Logic, Ethics, Aesthetics. What does it mean to discriminate? (Voice) Choose? MJ: Choose - or to place, organize, but primarily to choose, make choices.

"Now the transition begun in Chapter Eight from a logic to an ethics proceeds further to establish an aesthetics." What is logic? Logic is the discipline of thinking clearly. Logic is the organization of your thinking processes. What is ethics? Ethics is the organization of your living in a society. Ethics has to do with the right or the wrong acting in a group of people. There are only two schools of ethics. There is the utilitarian school of ethics, where the great goal is as Bentham and the Mills put it the greatest good for the greatest number. The greatest good for the greatest number, the utilitarian school of ethics, the practical, pragmatic school of ethics. Then there is the older school of ethics out of which Greek ethics built, Aristotelian ethics and the like. And there the idea is pleasure, or the Hedonistic ethics.



But in any case, it is the matter of the balance, it is . Page 2 , clear living as against clear thinking. - "proceeds further 1/17/81 to establish an esthetics." If ethics is social logic, esthetics is what kind of ethics? Spiritual ethics. That is, esthetics is the spiritual or the idealistic right or wrong. Ethics brings up the idea of the right or wrong. Logic is based on the true or false, ethics on the right or wrong, and esthetics on the good and the beautiful, as against the bad and the ugly. What are the three Platonic goals? The good, the true and the beautiful. The good, which is the ethics, the true which is the logic, and the beautiful which is the esthetics.

Contiguity and transitivity. - "The third major perspective of occult philosophy", and we are now in the dimension of the greater mysteries. It reflects what has already been pointed out, that life must become an art. All right, we're talking about spirituality then, getting going in this Chapter - "Spirituality has a preliminary identification as a reference to higher or sovereign, as compared with lower or pliant elements." Have you ever noticed that in dealing with people - if you deal with people in terms of the personality, the respect for personality, that your experience increasingly becomes an experience of dealing with the intractability in people? What's the term I had so much fun with in Astrology. How and Why It Works, - do you remember recalcitrance? Now the higher and sovereign elements are the elements that flatly refuse to be led around by the nose. The lower or pliant elements are the elements that allow themselves to be led around by the nose, either because they don't know it, or because they like it.

Are there people who like to be led around? (Voice) Definitely. MJ: Told what to do, and when to do it, have their problems solved for them. I heard at least one young man in the army - I wonder if any of you heard any young men in the recent war say they rather regret getting out of the army because they have to begin to act for themselves. In the army they didn't have to worry. They were told what to do.

"The introduction of divine sparks" - of undifferentiated spirit, along this line is again a superficial distinction. And again we have the dichotomy as spiritual transitivity and material contiguity. I think it was Margaret Ridge who suffered more than anyone else around on material contiguity. (MR: I still perk up whenever I hear it.) Material contiguity, or contiguity, or shall we put it in slang? Instead of saying material contiguity, shall we say spot jelling? Where things just blah down as they are, when they are where they are. The tendency to just flop - to just drape into position. As against that is spiritual transitivity. What's the difference between transitivity and intransitivity? (Voice) the one changes something and the other one is unchanged, it doesn't change anything and isn't changed in itself. MJ: Intransitive. A transitive verb passes on an act from a subject to an object - and intransitive verb keeps it in the subject. Spiritual transitivity then, is a spiritual passing on.

In the healing meeting, we had that brought out just tonight in the fact that the only characteristic of spirituality is the necessity of its sharing. It flows in, it passes on so that every individual spiritually speaking is fulfilling himself in his transient and momentary possession or enjoyment of something he has received graciously and is giving graciously. It is passing through him. We have to be very careful not to assimilate static ideas of spirituality. When spirituality runs riot it is a burlesque of itself, nothing is fixed; but when spirituality becomes static, everything is fixed, everything is orthodox, everything is



set.

Page 3  
1/17/81

The Three Great Dichotomies. Now, we have to press on beyond these definitions. "The first of the three great dichotomies - subject-object - is the basis for a profane mystery by presenting things as essentially disjunctive." That's a useful word. Do you know what conjunctive means? What's the disjunctive? Putting apart. Disjunctive - things are essentially disjunctive. The most primitive state of matter known to measurement, (now I'm not speaking of sub-atoms and the like that are merely theoretical) is found in the gases - that is, different kinds of matter are most alike in gaseous form. Is that right? And, the outstanding characteristic of gas is the tendency of all the elements that make it up to get as far apart from each other as possible. That's not fudging to put it that way, is it? (Voice) I don't think so.

MJ: You see, you can put a little bit of gas in a room, and if nothing else comes in to act, it will diffuse itself through the room completely. Or, it will diffuse itself in a liquid, or wherever it may be. It is this fundamental tendency of matter to be disjunctive. That's why celestial bodies move around each other - they have attraction on each other and their tendency is to draw together, and then if there is a balance in the masses instead of colliding they revolve around each other. If they are acting in a medium where they can act freely in respect to the laws of their forces. Disjunctive. This creates sequence, which is time; position, which is space; and structure, which is form. Giving us Chapters five, six and seven in the book.

"The second dichotomy or the general-specific dyad is correspondingly conjunctive." The general and specific bring things together. "It reveals a coalescence of all impersonally discrete existents in the simultaneity of significance (like time), compatibility and concern," -- Chapters Eight, Nine and Ten, that we have just finished. After pattern (Chapter Seven) we have consciousness (Chapter Eight) which is conjunctive. That's the concept of significance. Consciousness is significance. Significance is consciousness. Compatibility, the next stage, is being. Being is compatible. Anything exists as what it is, is in itself and what its milieu is in itself are mutually capable of interaction, so that being is compatibility. And concern (Chapter Ten) is self, self is intimacy, self is concern, self is sharing, self is flowing through. That's our second great perspective.

"The third step . . . is the disappearance of both disjunction and conjunction in assimilation." Now if we have disjunction and conjunction disappearing in assimilation, -- would it help if I spoke of intrajunction? -- from Latin intra "on the inside, within." But that word would be a sticker, and so we use assimilation. Things assimilate into each other.

"This is a completely social division of labor." Again what we were talking about in connection with Plotinus tonight; "an interconnection (or an interjunction) that is neither the contrast of separation nor the similitude of combination. Here the flow through each other of an individual and his fellows is an obliteration of every possible boundary between the acts-of-self and those of other-self." So the act-of-self is the act of other-self, and the act of other-self is the act of self.

"The dichotomy of freedom and necessity permits the approach to man's ethical and esthetic status in terms of his competence and conscience." And so in this chapter we are going to talk first about competence and then about conscience. This is intrajunction, or assimilation. Competence is what? The ability of a person to fit perfectly into any situation. Or the ability of anything to serve any pertinent purpose or role. That's what we mean by competent. That's assimilation on that



side. Assimilation on the other side, in terms of the high-Page 4  
er values, the all is conscience. That is, the self only 1/17/81  
lives, only acts, only moves as it is perfectly and to its own satis-  
faction a part of the universal scheme. Are there any questions?  
That's the introduction to the chapter, the two paragraphs from page 257  
to the middle of 259, and it gives us an idea of what we are heading  
into in the chapter on integration, Chapter Eleven.

Freedom. Now there are all sorts and kinds of superficial conceptions of  
freedom. It comes up all the time in correspondence with students. The  
question of free will. When do you have free will, and what is free  
will? It is discussed interminably. There always is the paradox that  
your ancestors speak in you, that your associates speak in you, that  
what happens to you speaks in you.

Don't ever forget my lard story - that's as good as anything I have ever  
found. Are there those here who do not know my lard story? Well, I was  
raised on good old-fashioned southern cooking with a series of Irish  
cooks, when I was young and things that were fried, were fried in lard -  
doughnuts and lots of good things - and we lived in Chicago where a  
large part of the lard of the country was produced. The stockyards were  
out there. As a matter of fact on the few occasions when the wind blew  
the wrong way we were very well aware of the fact that there were rend-  
ering plants in Chicago. You get a little bit of it here on Riverside  
Drive. It comes over on the right wind from New Jersey. I don't know  
whether those plants are still over in New Jersey or not but it is the  
world's most lovely sickening odor.

So, I went out to Santa Barbara on one of my early jobs and was riding  
high, getting what to me was a fine salary, and I couldn't spend it. So  
I was flush. That's the only way in the world to be rich, to be tak-  
ing in more money than you can possibly pass out. Then you are rich,  
and I was rich. I had the best room in the best boarding house in Santa  
Barbara for forty dollars a month. A wonderful private room, and meals  
that melted in your mouth, and everything that you could ask for, and I  
couldn't spend any more than that on meals and that sort of thing.

So, one day somebody came in, and to make conversation - - If you want  
to learn fast in life make wild cracks, stick your neck out, and the  
whole world will educate you. I have always followed that system. I  
speak up on the things about which I know the least - freely, and then  
the other fellow promptly educates me. It's a wonderfully effective way  
of learning things. Don't bother to speak up where you know your oats,  
because then you get mad if the other fellow contradicts you, but speak  
up where you really don't know anything, as though you knew and then you  
get educated. And so I was always doing that and I spoke up on cooking,  
about which I knew nothing, about a certain thing that had been fried  
in lard, and the landlady hit the ceiling. Lard, lard, that dirty ani-  
mal - she started in - everything in this house is fried in nice, clean  
vegetable crisco. Well, in my Chicago language, crisco was a substitute  
and we never wanted substitutes. It was a substitute for lard, so my  
inclination was to keep away from substitutes, but from that day to  
this if anybody mentions lard, I'm inclined to walk in the other direc-  
tion. As far as I am concerned, you've got to cook with crisco or some-  
thing is apt to happen to me. She turned me around from lard to crisco,  
and I stayed turned around. The rest of my life I could still visualize  
how she hit that ceiling. Lard - that dirty - and then she started.

Well, where's free will? Where's my free will when it comes to lard or  
crisco? (Voice) I think you said at one time that will is always free.  
It never needs the adjective, free.



MJ: Yes, when you are getting right down to technical terms, Page 5  
But using free will loosely as people use it in this discussion of freedom and limitation, the behaviorists will argue that you are conditioned in everything. Now, as an actual matter of fact, how do you examine any idea? You examine the consequences of the opposite. You think on the basis of the opposite. If the opposite idea of the behaviorist, that you are conditioned in everything is true, then you can't think anything through because of the complexity. Everything is caught up in its complexity, and the complex just simply grinds it to a stop.

The only reason that act acts, and life lives, and that being is, is in the fact that it is loose-jointed. There are some of these things that we put down axiomatically. One of the axioms is that there isn't any order in the universe except as it is put in the universe by a mind. It is awfully important. There isn't any order in your life except that you put order in your life by a mind, or allow a mind to put order in your life. If you don't yourself order your life, you will find that your life is made up of the most ridiculous repetition of cycles of upset, cycles of misunderstanding, and things of the sort. Anybody who tries to please everyone around him ends up not only the unhappiest individual in the world, but he usually ends up killing off one or two of the people he is trying to please. You see, you can't possibly be pleasing to the other person by trying to be what he wants you to be because the only fun in making anybody else what you want him to be is the fun of having him twist that around and come up with something else making that interesting. Otherwise it's flat. You can't possibly like anyone who agrees with you on all things at all times.

Now, you don't have to go to the other extreme and have a knock-down drag 'em out fight with everybody you know but it is flatly and physically impossible to be pleasing. In the first place, continuity of pleasingness ends up in a glut. You're sated. Anything, such as a piece of music that you like. Well, buy a record of it and start playing all day long. You like to eat something, so sit down and eat all you can get of it. You become sated. Continuity of pleasingness is impossible because pleasing is a feeling of transition, it is a convergence into a flow of the way you want it to go that makes a thing pleasing. But the pleasing part of it is very momentary and very ephemeral.

Have you ever made the mistake of trying to prolong a very happy evening with sometimes ludicrous, sometimes tragic, sometimes unhappy, and sometimes with very boring results? I might even tell Bea, who probably never would suspect it, that one good-night kiss can be very thrilling; two, still be thrilling, three or four or five or six can be very unpleasant. (Laughter) The first beefsteak is wonderful - I repeat, beefsteak - a third beefsteak - - We don't think clearly in these things. That's why I say a person is insensitive. You move on, you move on from your situation. People try to freeze dreams. It is very easy if you wake up in a dream, and the dream is interesting, to go slip back into it again. As far as I know, anyone except a person who doesn't dream can do it, and if not easily, he can train himself to do it very easily. You do it in exactly the same way that you hold a situation in life. If you are in a room, the room is interesting and then for some unknown reason you start walking out of the room and you wish you hadn't walked out of the room. Well, what do you do? You just go back in the room. You can go back into the room in your imagination, you can go back into the room in your dream, and just go back in it, not trying to do anything, because if you use your conscious will then you see your dream state is spoiled. You don't use your conscious will, you just revert into it.

It is exactly the same thing you do when you want to remember something



you can't remember. How do you remember something you can't Page 6 remember? You relax into it. If you have to remember it in 1/17/81 a hurry, you have to get it in the same way that you get a kitten to come over to you. You've got to attract it by something like it.

I had the most ridiculous mental stutter the other day - I couldn't think of contingent beneficiary - and I needed it because I was writing a letter, and I had a lot of letters to write and there was the paper right in the typewriter. Now why should I forget contingent beneficiary? Well, the more I would struggle for it, the more I would freeze it out of my mind, so it was necessary to relax into it. So I just prowled around for a few minutes in various phases of the idea of the removes in a benefit. I finally thought of it, and put it in the letter.

You forget a name. The mind will always blank out under strain, most unpredictably, sometimes most embarrassingly, or you will say this and mean this and not only say this when you mean this, but do it over, and over, and over again. I had a streak of calling Grace Post, Ruth - remember? (End of first reel)

Freedom is not dissociation from the cosmos. There's where the fallacy is. And many people think of freedom as fundamentally a matter of disconnection, disjunction from the cosmos, that you are free because you don't have to have anything to do with the things around you except as you want to and that's what freedom is. The difficulty then is the difficulty in the conception of freedom.

Now, on the other hand, association with the cosmos or conjunction cannot be made the basis of freedom either. There are lots of people who think that way. That is, they think of a man who is rich as free because he has lots of money, that he has the means to do what he wants to do so that makes him free. A man - well, I suppose one of the places where the word free turns up more often than anywhere else is in marriage and divorce where a person says I've got to get a divorce, I've got to be free. If I get rid of my wife or my husband, I'm free. Or, I get out of this job, and I'm free. But freedom isn't a matter of specific relations at all. A man who is married is not free if to him marriage is limitation. But a man who is married is free if marriage to him is the division of labor that enables him to do what two people can do instead of what only one person can do. They've got to put their freedom in a different way. Now, here in the book we go back to beginnings, to the fact that a man is anchored, immutably anchored in the cosmos, that he is, is the only constant, the only thing known to him that is constant. The fact that he continues to be. His heredity arises ultimately in the life stream to which he belongs. This is an infinite totality that exists in perfect parallel with all possible reality of any variant kind. Does that make sense to you? This is an infinite totality.

The milieu of common connection. There was a discussion on that in Time the other day in connection with the Mayflower. I figured back to the sixth century B.C. once and figured I had five million ancestors in the sixth century B.C. That is, I was wondering if it was possible that as an ego in terms of reincarnation I knew some people, whether it would be possible for there to be a physical tie there, heredity -. Well, there is a pretty good chance because there are five million ramifications into which it could flow. So that is an infinite totality. Now, of course, there are cross-overs, in breeding, which cut the number way down, but at the same time there is the infinite outreach in every possible direction. That is, can you talk to any individual for very long without finding that you have something in common? Or, I'll put it another way. Can you find a very great sense of commonness with a given individual, without finding points of common impact in your mutual background?



I think one of the most interesting things in all the world Page 7  
with my Priscilla. When you get your Morris book, read the 1/17/81  
foreword. I go back and give some credit to an art teacher in Univer-  
sity high school. And then I decided it might be a mistake just to put  
myself down on record as being connected with the gentleman, because the  
gentleman got expelled from school just shortly after I was there, be-  
cause he was mixed up with some of the young boys in the school. So I  
glossed over that, but put it down so that anybody who was in on the  
know would know that I knew it, and make allowances for it.

I had great trouble finding out the name of that man. I wrote out to  
Lionel Tompkins and some other chap and finally checked through and  
got the chap's name. Didn't mention it particularly, and put it in the  
manuscript and we were reading it over and everything was all right -  
and when I mentioned the name Priscilla burst out laughing and said,  
"Why I told you about him!" Don't you remember when my brother and so  
and so, and so and so, etc. It was the same man. There was a conver-  
gence of this same art teacher in two completely unrelated families,  
except that it happened that one of her brothers went to one of the same  
schools that I went to so there was that connection. And I ran all  
around Robin Hood's barn -. Did you ever have that happen to you?

You see, over and over and over again in life, if you are sensitive, or  
if you are curious, or if you rummage around a little bit, or look a-  
round a little bit, - you go to a perfectly strange home, take a look at  
the library, the books - take some of the books that have meaning to you  
and after a while you will find that one of those has meaning to the  
person who owns the library. And so in terms of that book, you talk  
about your experiences, and you will find that you will tap into a mil-  
ieu of common connection, almost inevitably, and you can have a lot of  
fun tracing it out, if you want to go to the work of doing it. Where do  
you trace that sort of thing out? In the process of getting acquaint-  
ed in romance. Two people are drawn to each other. Why are they drawn  
to each other? Well, there is a feeling of something in common. What  
happens if they stand pat on that? It thins out - sated - there isn't  
much to it, so it's got to be enriched. How do you enrich it? By find-  
ing more commonness: you ramify out this way and you ramify out this way,  
and you talk and you exchange experiences and all at once you discover  
that you both knew JoeJenks, and so you talk about that. Or, you can  
drop into a public place. It used to be wonderful in California; you  
could go into any restaurant and talk to a person at a table. They  
were days of leisure in southern California when people would sit and  
talk, and you would find that you could get common experiences. We'd go  
to Orcas Island. Riding over on the ferry I'd sit down by a chap at  
random at the front of the boat, we'd start talking, the real estate bus-  
iness, southern California, we'd start comparing notes and find lots of  
common experience. You can find common experience anywhere, with any-  
body anywhere. You see, you can't in the statistical shuffle of the  
universe, sit down next to a person, that there isn't that potential  
there if you run it through.

Freedom through handicap. Now, does that mean that you have no freedom?  
you can talk or not talk. You can run it down, or not run it down.  
There is no compulsion. As an actual matter of fact there is more free-  
dom because of this than there will be without it. The more limitation  
there is in life, the more freedom there is because the more limitation  
in a given area the more choice becomes simple and the more simple  
choice becomes, the more free you are in making a choice.

There isn't anybody as free, if he want to be, as the man who is locked  
up in a penitentiary. Nobody can tell him to come here or there, or do  
this or to do that beyond his penitentiary routine. He has a very limit-  
ed routine into which to make adjustments, and if he can philosophize



that, then he is completely free, he's got his whole life in Page 8 his own hands; he is immensely free. Some of the greatest 1/17/81 thinking in the world has been done by people who have been immensely handicapped by limitation, because the limitation has given them the greater freedom. On the other hand, the person who has absolutely no constrictions around him at all, who has wealth, health, leisure, everything that the soul and mind of man might ask for - his freedom doesn't mean anything at all because it is too diffused. There isn't anything to give it meaning.

"Infinite totality exists in perfect parallel with all possible reality of any variant kind - " That is, there is an infinite totality in the case of everyone in this room, but it is in parallel with the infinite totality of everybody else. And together "these things comprise an organic universality of function which in its ramification is funneled continually into the very center of any human individuality. The illimitable potential of assimilation has been introduced as the microcosmic-macrocosmic complex of all experience." Man is the microcosm in perfect parallel with the macrocosm. Or, it has been seen as the protean atom. That protean atom - those of you who will be getting the Strömberg book, The Soul of the Universe, it is very interesting, because Gustaf Strömberg worked that out in terms of the field theory and groping around for a way to express it, I finally ended up with the protean atom. Two independently derived concepts exactly alike, one by a ranking scientist in the field of science and the other by a thinker in the occult field. But when you read your Strömberg, notice the parallel and notice how much it helps understanding this, or visa-versa.

"Here is an entity of immortal order, which can be both untrammelled and constricted." That's what makes it immortal - it can be both limited and free. It is not disjunction - this or this - it is not conjunction - this with this - it is intrajunction, both or neither or either. Very difficult idea, but it is an idea once gotten that will enable you to think through any problem of the cosmos whether it is astrology, psychology or science or anything else. Think it right through, work it right through.

Disappearing consequences. So, "beginning and end, together with any fixed distinction of a here and there, provide the immutably binding conditions of all lesser existence. Lower manifestation as encountered by man is external to itself - that is, it is definitely originated in the various and transient phases by which it shares his being - so that it may be said to have its character given to it by something alien to its own genius." The outside. "As a result it may cease to be, wholly or in part." That is, it can die, it can be destroyed. Anything that has its reality given to it, you see, has beginning and end, has here and there, so it is destructible. "It escapes the causal chains set up by its acts!" That being so - - you see, if something can be very destructive, but can be destroyed then it doesn't suffer any consequences for its destructive action. That is, as far as the law is concerned, if a man murders his wife and commits suicide at the same time, he suffers no consequences under the law for murdering his wife. He can subtract himself. (Voice) Under codified law, you mean, or in the natural law? MJ: Under ordinary law - yes, it is codified law. You see, there is no way of punishing a man for committing suicide. (Voice) No, but what about the spiritual law? MJ: Well, that's an infinite regression, if we go into the spiritual world then we will have to state it over again, but it will still operate. You see, no matter what the consequences - no matter what the consequences of anything may be, karmically speaking, you can walk out on them, you can cancel yourself.



You see that in spiritual work all the time, fortunately. not Page 9 often. Maybe "all the time" is a bad word. Put it this way. 1/17/81 Every once in a while in the spiritual work you see somebody walk right out on the reality - just walk right out. Becomes indifferent and so no longer suffers any of the consequences of the acts. Gets out of all the agonizing and everything else. (Voice) You don't mean by getting out of the world -- MJ: By getting out of the area of interest, just getting out of the area of interest, leaving it. Somebody may study occultism and get a very keen sense of karma, and become very interested in his own causal results of his indiscretions, and then the day comes when he simply gets tired of it and quits, and he drops it, and he is no longer worried about consequences and by and large he no longer suffers them. (Voice) Well, isn't that dropping them, tho, the starting of another cause, a sort of transference -- MJ: Oh, yes, it starts another one, as far as that cause -- (Voice) You're not escaping anything, you're merely eliminating a cause by starting something else -- MJ: You're escaping that cause, and the other cause is not karmic relative to that. (Voice) No.

Freedom to accept limitation. MJ: Or, put it the other side, put it positively. A man by changing consciousness - religious conversion - may turn his back on the way he has been living and by living a new way, escapes all the consequences of his former evil way of life. There are some limitations. If a man has ruined his health by drinking and he quits drinking, his health is still ruined. But, except as you reduce it to the absurd by taking it too literally, the consequences of an evil life are the way a man assimilates himself in the life around him, being evil. Now he sees the consequences as the consequences of his acts in the past. But the consequences are never the consequences of the acts of the past, they are consequences of the attitude and acts in the present. Now he breaks that chain by a conversion. He becomes changed, he has a different attitude, and so we say God forgives him, his sins are forgiven, and there are no consequences of those sins. If he has cut off his arm by being in an accident when he was drunk, his arm doesn't grow again but in general, as far as his life is concerned he can go on in a new and a free way.

Or a person can live a perfectly exemplary life - the consequences of which are many rewards - he gets to know people, they like him, they have jobs, they bring him work, and he suddenly starts in leading an evil life. Now he has built up over the years the rewards of people bringing him business, trusting him, letting him handle their money, and so forth but when they see what kind of a guy he is now, they don't do it. And the consequences disappear because his attitude has disappeared. Does that make it any clearer? Do you see what I'm driving at? A line of sequence operates only as long as the frame of reference goes unchanged. That's one of our axioms, you know. As long as the frame of reference goes unchanged, then your causal lines operate predictively. But change your frame of reference, and everything changes with it. You can change your frame of reference any time you want to - that's why you're free - because you can be at once limited and unbound; and you can take the one, discard the other, assimilate this way, or that way as you please.

There comes to my mind the choice, the heroic action in the harbor at Halifax. There was a French steamer loaded with powder, caught on fire. I say loaded with powder - that's the French word. Loaded with ammunition. Well, the crew abandoned the ship, rowed ashore and got away and none of them were hurt. But there was a ship there, a British man-of-war with a fire crew and the fire crew put off in a boat, and rowed, got up to the ship, and in single file, with their apparatus bravely disappeared down the hold, and just then the ship went up and flattened Halifax. Almost



completely destroyed the city. Thousands of people were killed. When I think of that heroic crew that walked into that, the small chance there was of doing anything, and yet they went in there heroically. That's accepting limitation but there is a freedom in it. There is a freedom in the human soul in the acceptance of that thing. Page 10  
1/17/81

Now, what am I trying to drive home in getting into this discussion tonight? I am trying to bring to light for you or to drive home for you what I mean by intrajunction, by assimilation. That it is not things in contrast to each other, it is not things that are like each other but it is things in their awareness of each other. And we think of that only in terms of free and limited, conditioned and open. It is the third point of view. It is the Solar mysteries point of view, and it is the hardest of all points of view to get, so we'll spend as much time on it as necessary, in order to get it. Are there any questions? (Voice) Well, granted that this line of men from the British man-of-war going into the French ammunition ship, did so from choice - I can see that. They also might have been in a situation where to go meant death and not to go also meant death. For instance, if a soldier has been given a command to go forward, and the officer's gun is at his back, is he free?

MJ: There is a possibility that they realized that their own ship would not escape the explosion anyway, although as an actual matter of fact the men who were killed on ships around - I don't think were the men in the ships. You see the ships were in the water and they could withstand the explosion better than the houses on the shore. They were flattened. And I doubt that in that crew there was any idea that it was sure death anyway, or even that it was sure death on the powder ship. It was a volunteer proposition. (Voice) Oh, a volunteer -- M.J. You see the officer on the man-of-war going off on another ship with a fire crew would call for volunteers. A powder ship on fire. But you have that. One of the American heroes who was posthumously decorated was a chap who to save his comrades blew himself to pieces with a hand grenade. Now you don't ordinarily think of that type with the American young lad, but if you read those citations, they were all given in Life about a month or so ago. There is one occasion, where this fellow just willingly as a choice between a lot of people all being killed, just took it in his own hands, and he was decorated for it. And it was a surprise to me because I don't remember anything of that sort in our psychology. That's more an Oriental sort of thing, more of the old world spirit in human nature.

(End of reel two)